

The Irrepressible Issue

Despite Mr. Bryan and Secretary Daniels, whenever Democrats sit down together prohibition persists in pushing into the party.

The latest occasion was the testimonial dinner to Homer S. Cummings, the National Democratic Chairman.

Gov. Smith of New York, though unable to be present, did not fail to get into his telegram a reference to the eighteenth amendment as "a restriction against personal liberty which Prussia in her palmiest days never dreamed of."

Gov. Edwards of New Jersey contrived to outwit an embarrassed dinner committee and deliver a prepared speech which must have spoiled the taste of Secretary Daniel's soda water.

Said the Governor of New Jersey:

"I deny the right of men elected to congress on totally different issues and without any reference to prohibition to saddle that condition on the American people without a referendum on the subject.

"The issue was not presented on either Democratic or Republican platforms and the people were not consulted.

"I deny the right of congress to legislate at all, except as a military measure, upon the right of the people of the states to choose the form of domestic economy and government they desire under the constitution

"To me this situation is a political sacrilege and I purpose to carry the fight to San Francisco, regardless of what any man or any set of men may think, so as to bring about a popular re-statement of the doctrine of state rights and popular local home rule upon which our fathers founded this government."

Does anybody believe that Gov. Smith and Gov. Edwards are the only Democrats determined that the eighteenth amendment and the methods by which it was jammed into the federal constitution shall not be glossed over in the interest of party harmony?

The issue will not down.

Mr. Bryan can no more shoot it out of Democratic councils than Republican leaders can obscure it by dint of desperate party demonstrations in other directions.

A Republican legislature in this state has not hushed up prohibition by raising a hullabaloo over Socialist members of the assembly.

Prohibition is another of the present issues which cleave through party lines and bring the people of United States face to face with questions more fundamental than the protection of party fences.

Political managers may talk themselves hoarse trying to prove that party solidarity comes first and that prohibition is a settled fact which must not be dragged in to cause dissension.

There are millions of Americans who are resolved that in spite of past mistakes, personal freedom shall not be shelved and forgotten in the United States without a struggle.

Prohibition is going to play a big part in coming political campaigns in more than one section of the country. No party can save itself by pretending to ignore it.—New York World.

THE PRICE THAT WOULD BE PAID

Eastern Democrats who are disposed to induce the Democratic National convention to repudiate prohibition or to affect a straddling compromise on the matter of uniform application of the prohibition laws, may as well understand in advance that if they were to work their will in the matter there would not be a state west of the Mississippi river in the Democratic column on election day. This is not the view of fanatical prohibitionists. It is the judgment of men who are in position to know and men who have never been identified with the prohibition movement, though most of them have viewed the wiping out of the saloons with satisfaction, and have accepted prohibition as a moral and common sense proposition.

Western states which have had prohibition for years could not be induced to part with it, under any consideration, and their neighboring states, though they have lacked the moral and political courage to act independently on the matter, are in full accord with the prohibition policy. Conspicuous western leaders, editors, and public men, who fought the adoption of prohibition, have since confessed the error of their judgment and cleaner court records, better social conditions, business improvement, and comparatively or literally empty jails testify to the

beneficent effects of the abolition of booze and the saloon.

The purely specious plea for the great number of employes in breweries, distillers and saloons who were to be thrown out of employment and left helpless and starving has been made ridiculous by the employment of all these men in worthier occupations at higher wages. The great brewery properties of the west that were to stand idle, monuments to the arbitrary destruction of "property rights," are busy turning out more wholesome and desirable products. In the states that were dry before the federal prohibition went into effect, the wages that were slobbered over the bar on Saturday night, while the homes and families were in need, have been going to the grocery stores and the clothing stores and shoe stores. That is the difference.

One of the chief difficulties with eastern politicians is that they have not yet learned very much about the United States and its people as a whole. They have not learned that the politics of the country is no longer made between Batavia and Albany, or on a commuters' train between Peekskill and New York, nor yet in Trenton, New Jersey. Manhattan Island may be the pocket nerve of the nation but it is not the heart and the conscience, or the brain. It has become merely the part that it is, an important piece in the machine but by no means the entire works, nor even the main spring.

Out in the great west, a mammoth empire, where freer opportunities have built broader individual and communal character, and opened a wider and truer vision than is possible on Baxter street or Fifth avenue, there is economic, moral, and political progress that eastern politicians, for the most part, do not comprehend and have not yet even learned that they must try to comprehend. Leaving Chicago, and its vassal state of Illinois, out of the reckoning, the west may be counted on to be solidly against any party that tries to drag down prohibition or even to coquette with booze. And they are not mere prohibition fanatics in that region either. They tried the other thing with characteristic western thoroughness.—Peekskill, N. Y., News.

PROHIBITION AT SAN FRANCISCO

Gov. Edwards of New Jersey has displaced Chairman Cummings of the Democratic national committee in the discussion of prohibition with Mr. Bryan. The change will add to popular interest in the controversy.

Gov. Edwards may be described as a wet of the wets—politically considered, as the wettest wet in the country. He is in office solely by reason of his pledged devotion to the wet cause. He was its candidate last year, and elected by a large majority. Elsewhere, in the state races, the Republicans won. It was a Republican year. But, in New Jersey, the Democratic candidate for governor, standing on a platform which he interpreted as promising that Democratic success should mean the making of the state "as wet as the Atlantic ocean," was easily elected. He probably received a good many Republican votes.

Mr. Bryan may be described as a dry of the dries—politically considered, as the driest dry in the country. He has led the dry cause in the Democratic party for years.

On the question of prohibition these two men are as the poles apart. It would appear impossible to bring them together. And yet both are Democrats, and likely to meet at San Francisco. Both are mentioned in connection with the Democratic nomination for President.

While Gov. Edwards is not, and not likely to become, a formidable figure in the presidential equation, the cause for which he stands is certain to have vigorous champions at San Francisco insisting on some sort of recognition for it in the platform. So that it is not Gov. Edwards so much as the anti-prohibition influence Mr. Bryan is now stacked up against. He has a fight on his hands which will try his mettle and resources as a political general.

Mr. Bryan could not support Gov. Edwards or any other man for President standing on a platform demanding the repeal, or the nullification indirectly, of the eighteenth amendment to the Constitution, nor could Gov. Edwards support Mr. Bryan for President on a platform demanding and promising the rigid enforcement of that act and a nomination made on a platform evading the prohibition issue would not be worth acceptance.

Mr. Bryan is adding materially to the "pen" of politics, and justifying in many ways the judgment of those who have appraised him as a live wire.—Washington Star.

THE ROLL OF HONOR

States That Have Ratified the National Woman Suffrage Amendment

- 1—WISCONSIN, June 10, 1919.
- 2—ILLINOIS, June 10, 1919.
- 3—MICHIGAN, June 10, 1919.
- 4—KANSAS, June 16, 1919.
- 5—OHIO, June 16, 1919.
- 6—NEW YORK, June 16, 1919.
- 7—PENNSYLVANIA, June 24, 1919.
- 8—MASSACHUSETTS, June 25, 1919.
- 9—TEXAS, June 28, 1919.
- 10—IOWA, July 2, 1919.
- 11—MISSOURI, July 3, 1919.
- 12—ARKANSAS, July 28, 1919.
- 13—MONTANA, July 30, 1919.
- 14—NEBRASKA, August 2, 1919.
- 15—MINNESOTA, Sept. 8, 1919.
- 16—NEW HAMPSHIRE, Sept. 10, 1919.
- 17—UTAH, Sept. 30, 1919.
- 18—CALIFORNIA, Nov. 1, 1919.
- 19—MAINE, Nov. 5, 1919.
- 20—NORTH DAKOTA, Dec. 1, 1919.
- 21—SOUTH DAKOTA, Dec. 4, 1919.
- 22—COLORADO, Dec. 12, 1919.
- 23—RHODE ISLAND, Jan. 6, 1920.
- 24—KENTUCKY, Jan. 6, 1920.
- 25—OREGON, Jan. 13, 1920.
- 26—INDIANA, Jan. 16, 1920.
- 27—WYOMING, Jan. 27, 1920.
- 28—NEVADA, Feb. 7, 1920.
- 29—NEW JERSEY, FEB. 9, 1920.
- 30—IDAHO, Feb. 11, 1920.
- 31—ARIZONA, Feb. 12, 1920.
- 32—NEW MEXICO, Feb. 19, 1920.
- 33—OKLAHOMA, Feb. 29, 1920.
- 34—WEST VIRGINIA, March 10, 1920.

ONE OF THE OLD GUARDS

Okmulgee, Okla., January 23, 1920.

Mr. Edgar Howard, Columbus, Neb.

My Dear Sir: I read with much appreciation, your toast to the Old Guard in the Commoner of January. While I may not be one of the Old Guard, I am proud that I was one of the Home Guards of Lincoln in 1900 and was with the organization at Kansas City to the convention that year.

I began to support Mr. Bryan in Pennsylvania in 1896 and have been for him every minute since and am for him now. I am very glad to note the part Mr. Bryan is now taking in affairs of the party and it is my judgment that without his advice they are due a defeat.

Mr. Bryan is the only man that can fully marshal the vote of the democratic party this time and it is my judgment that he can with against any man.

I find that twelve years of democratic rule has put in the saddle the pie-eating brand of democrats and they may try to keep Mr. Bryan from asserting himself at the convention and for this reason we should be on our guard. Mr. Cummings indicates that spirit.

Wishing you every success in the world and my very best cooperation in the campaign for Bryan for president I beg to be, Very truly,

M. M. ALEXANDER.

CAN ANY ONE BEAT THIS?

"For President—Wm. J. Bryan of Nebraska. Platform—16 to 1 without any more delay or dampcoolishness."—Scribner News, Friday, April 12, 1895.

The above is a copy of an editorial "masthead" written by W. H. Weekes of The Press, who then owned and published the Scribner News. It appeared, as readers will observe, fourteen months before Bryan's nomination. The Press undoubtedly may claim without fear of refutation that Mr. Weekes is the original Nebraska Bryan man now living to see the great Commoner resuming his place as leader of democracy. The Scribner News was the first paper in the whole United States to use Mr. Bryan's name as shown above.—Norfolk, Neb., Press.

WOMEN INDORSE LEAGUE; VETO TRAINING

Indorsement of the league of nations and recorded opposition to universal compulsory military training were the most important actions taken by the League of Women Voters at the closing session of its convention. Both measures were passed by comfortable majorities, but only after there had been stubborn, spirited opposition from the floor.—Chicago Tribune.